DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 417 UD 016 710

TITLE	Nebraska State Department of Education Annual Evaluation Report-1975.
INSTITUTION	Nebraska State Dept. of Education, Lincoln.
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	60p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education Programs; Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Programs; Inservice Programs; *Mathematics; Parent Participation; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Public Schools; Reading Achievement; *Reading Programs; School Integration
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; *Nebraska

ABSTRACT

A description and evaluation of components of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I-funded projects for the state of Nebraska is presented in this document. The Omaha Nebraska Public Schools have a very comprehensive ESEA Title I program and their data is presented separately. In all projects, major emphasis was placed on reading and mathematics activities. Parent Advisory Councils were an important part of these Title I programs. One example of excellent parental involvement was at North Platte, where parents adopted the use of an ESEA Title III "packet program" in which packets were given to the parents to be used at home with their pre-school children. These packets supplemented the classes that the children attended and contained materials parents could use to help their children attain various skills. Inservice teacher education was another important element of Title I programs in Nebraska and was provided for teachers, aides, administrators and staff. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED133417

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT - 1975

NEBRASKA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

M. ANNE CAMPBELL

JOHN BAILLIE

COORDINATOR OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

DONALD L. BYRNES

STATE DIRECTOR, TITLE I, ESEA

NEBRASKA STATE TITLE I STAFF

DOUGLAS D. COLBERG

JESS M. MEDINA

VICKEY RADCLIFFE

MERWIN L. SMITH

UD016710

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FY 1975

preface

The ESEA Title I section of the Nebraska State Department of Education has objectives in five major areas:

(1) to assist Nebraska local educational agencies in complying with P.L. 93-380 and Title I, ESEA, Rules and Regulations;

(2) to account by activity and budget entry for every dollar expended in Title I programs being conducted in Nebraska school districts;

(3) to monitor on-site Nebraska school districts which represent approximately 75% of the State Title I allocation;

(4) to assist and provide staff development for Title I teachers in establishing remedial activities and interpreting diagnostic data and initiating individualized activities; and

(5) to increase the reading performance level of Title I, ESEA program participants by at least one year.

It has been the purpose of the Nebraska State Title I office to pursue activities with these main objectives in mind. Our evaluation report reflects information that describes the extent to which these objectives have been met. The report is broken down into these major areas:

(1) Monitoring and Technical Assistance

(2) Needs Assessment

(3) Parent Advisory Councils

(4) Inservice

(5) Impact Data in Reading and Math

(6) Expenditures and Project Statistics

table of contents

Preface.....i

List of Tables.....iii

Staff Visits.....1

Needs Assessment.....3

Parent Advisory Councils.....4

Inservice.....6

Impact Data.....7

Omaha.....21

Other Success.....25

Statistics.....27

Appendices.....42

tables

1. Reading Students by Mean Gain & Grade.....9
2. Math Students by Mean Gain & Grade.....10
3. Reading Mean Gain by IQ & Grade Level.....11
4. Math Mean Gain by IQ & Grade Level.....12
5. Reading Mean Gain by Sex & IQ.....13
6. Math Mean Gain by Sex & IQ.....14
7. Mean Gain by Grade Level--Reading.....15
8. Mean Gain by Grade Level--Math.....16
9. Math Students by Mean Gain & Tests Given.....17
10. Reading Students by Mean Gain & Tests Given.....18
11. Reading "Graduates" by Grade Level.....19
12. Math "Graduates" by Grade Level.....20
13. School Year Student Count by Activity & Grade Level.....28
14. Summer School Student Count by Activity & Grade Level.....29
15. Nonpublic Students--Summer School.....30
16. Nonpublic Students--School Year.....31
17. Ratio of Students to Teachers--Summer School.....32
18. Ratio of Students to Teachers--School Year.....33
19. Non-teachers by Activity--School Year.....34
20. Non-teachers by Activity--Summer School.....35
21. Per Pupil Cost by Activity--School Year.....36
22. Per Pupil Cost by Activity--Summer School.....37
23. Average Expenditures Per Project--School Year.....38
24. Average Expenditures Per Project--Summer School.....39
25. Percent of Students & Expenditures by Activity--School Year.....40
26. Percent of Students & Expenditures by Activity--Summer School.....41

staff visits

The primary responsibilities of the ESEA Title I state consultants are to monitor approved activities and provide technical assistance to local educational agencies. The programs selected for monitoring were chosen on the basis of the amount of their grant, their request and achievement data. There were 83 schools visited during the school year. These schools were approved for approximately 70% of Nebraska's grant and represent 32% of the projects. There were 36 summer projects visited. They represent 78% of the summer projects.

During the monitoring visits the consultants examined the projects for their quality, their compliance to Title I regulations and their adherence to the activities which were approved in their applications. The monitoring report form that was used during the visits was compiled by the State Title I consultants. A copy of the monitoring report appears as Appendix A. The summer monitoring report, which was also developed by the State Title I consultants, appears as Appendix B.

With larger school districts a team of consultants conducted the on-site visit. With several consultants visiting these projects, a more in-depth review could be conducted. The monitoring activity provided the direct opportunity for the SEA to influence LEA project development, as well as to aid in the collection of project information. The information that was collected is presented later in this report under impact data.

Regional workshops were held by the SEA in April and May in cooperation with the State Aid and Finance Section. The sessions included a section for bookkeepers in LEA projects to meet with the State Title I auditor.

Title I consultants also made presentations on the FY 1974 statewide evaluation results, comparability, the application form and the proposed rules and regulations. The State Aid and Finance director discussed the coordination of Title I with LB 448 which provides State money to existing Title I projects which have students meeting established criteria.

Regional technical assistance workshops were held in order to expedite the application review and approval process. The workshops were held outside the immediate Lincoln area and were designed to assist those school districts which would be required to travel some distance to get to Lincoln. The workshops offered school districts the opportunity to receive the necessary technical assistance in order to complete an approvable Title I application.

needs assessment

Before a Nebraska Title I application can be approved, a needs assessment must be undertaken. This can be done by using standardized test results, and in some cases, teacher judgment. Grades one through six must be assessed by all projects and an assessment of any other grade level to be served must also be included. An example of the grade level assessment sheets used in Nebraska is shown as Appendix D.

Both reading and math must be assessed. A priority student is one who is below the fiftieth percentile in both subjects. During 1974-75 Nebraska Title I projects were able to serve 69% of the students identified as priority students. Omaha uses a different needs assessment form. Therefore, their results are not included in this table:

STATE NEEDS ASSESSMENT DATA

GRADES	PARTICIPANTS	PRIORITY STUDENTS	%
P & K	720	491	146%
1-3	8184	8796	93%
4-6	8422	12538	67%
7-9	3789	6536	58%
10-12	826	3369	24%
TOTAL	21941	31730	69%

parent advisory councils

Parent Advisory Councils are not only required for each school district with a Title I activity, but also each attendance center. This change in regulations meant that during the past school year each district with multiple attendance centers having a Title I activity had to form building-level councils. As with the district councils, they have tended to focus on three main functions: (1) providing feedback for decision making; (2) involvement in activities in and for the project; and (3) educating themselves and others about the project.

One example of excellent parental involvement is at North Platte. In their summer Title I activity for pre-school students, they adopted the use of an ESEA Title III "packet program" in which packets were given to the parents to use at home with their children. These packets supplemented the classes that the children attended and contained materials parents could use to help their children attain various skills. Three teachers worked with the parents in a series of six workshops. Approximately half of the parents participated. These parents were most appreciative of being given the opportunity, training and materials to work with their children at home. Many of them were interested in continuing the packet program during the regular school year.

Many of the councils try to get feedback from their members about the program and its benefits to their children. The PAC at Centura Public Schools at Cairo developed a questionnaire for the members. Some of the comments by their PAC members included positive remarks about their children's progress. Parents were interested in visiting other Title I projects and in obtaining materials to work with their students at home.

It appears that districts are looking to SEA personnel for more help with their parent advisory councils than they have in the past. During the year the SEA personnel tried to meet with parent groups on request. They also distributed copies of the OE handbook for PAC's. The SEA will be increasing its efforts during 1976-77 to meet the needs of the LEA's in involving parents of their Title I students.

During the school year there were 2,073 members who served on district-wide councils. This is an average of 8 members per council. They averaged 3.3 district-wide meetings across the state. There was an average of 5 members on each building-level council. Of these members 83% were parents of students in public schools and 11% were parents of students in private schools. Of all the members 84% were parents of Title I participants. The building-level councils averaged 3 meetings during the school year.

During the summer school program there were 314 members who served on district-wide councils. This is an average of 7 members per council. There was an average of 4 members on each building-level council during the summer. Of the members on building-level councils, 86% were parents of students in public schools and 10% were parents of students in private schools. Of all the members 74% were parents of Title I participants. The building-level councils averaged 3 meetings during the summer school term.

inservice

Inservice is an important element of the Title I program. If a Title I program has teacher aides, then this element is crucial in providing for their training. Inservice activities involved 744 people paid out of Title I funds in school year programs and 209 in summer programs. There were 283 school year staff not paid out of Title I funds who were involved in these inservice activities and 3 in summer programs. Approximately 66% of the school year projects were funded for planned inservice activities and 48% of the summer projects. Of the inservice participants 46% were Title I teachers; 18% were non-Title I teachers; 21% were Title I aides; 1% were non-Title I aides; 5% were Title I administrators; 2% were non-Title I administrators; 5% were other Title I staff; and 2% were other non-Title I staff.

The summer institute for Title I teachers was again sponsored by Kearney State College and Educational Service Unit #9 in Hastings. Two sessions were held this summer. The first session was composed of fifty Title I teachers from around the state and an SEA Title I consultant. The second session was a follow-up of last year's workshop with 23 returning Title I teachers and an SEA Title I consultant. Both institutes were designed to provide participants with an opportunity to acquire new knowledge and skills which are helpful in meeting the needs of educationally disadvantaged children. The sessions were designed to upgrade their skills in identification, diagnosis and remediation. Participants were also able to obtain college credits for the institute. On the basis of the evaluations of previous participants, the activities were altered to provide the most relevant experiences for Title I teachers. Money was reallocated to districts, when possible, to pay teachers for their tuition and/or expenses.

impact data

The Local Evaluation Report for Nebraska school districts requests pre- and posttest scores for all students in Title I reading and math activities in grades three through twelve. Some schools also submitted scores for first and second graders. Excluding Omaha, there were test scores on 14,256 students in Title I reading activities and 4,073 students in Title I math activities. This represents 80% of the students participating in Title I reading activities and 82% of the students participating in Title I math activities. Omaha provides an analysis of their own scores, and a summary of that information is included later on in this report. Only scores from students who took equivalent pre- and posttests were used. The mean gain in Title I reading activities was 1.05, and the mean gain in Title I math activities was 1.09.

Information concerning reading and math gains for Nebraska Title I students is included on the following tables. At the bottom of each table is a summary of data on that table which is significant and pertinent to statewide Title I results. The Omaha information is excluded on all of these tables.

The mean gain bands and the IQ bands by which the data are shown are the same bands as used in previous Nebraska State Title I Evaluation Reports. Besides results for the 1974-75 school year, longitudinal mean gains by project have been assembled for the past four years of reading scores and for the past three years of math scores. These longitudinal gains by project are not included in this report in order to discourage comparisons of projects solely on the basis of standardized test scores.

These longitudinal records aided the SEA in determining which schools might need assistance and visits during FY 1976.

Standardized test scores are not required for summer school programs. Often teacher-made tests are used to evaluate summer school progress since they require less time to administer and score. However, some schools did record standardized test data. A sample of these scores revealed that the mean gain in reading was over three months for 814 students. This was 27% of the reading participants. The mean gain in summer math activities was over four months for 675 students. This represents 30% of the math activities.

1

READING STUDENTS
BY MEAN GAIN & GRADE
SCHOOL YEAR

MEAN GAIN BANDS	0 - .70 MEAN GAIN	.71 - 1.00 MEAN GAIN	1.01 - 1.50 MEAN GAIN	1.51 OR MORE MEAN GAIN	TOTAL
GRADE LEVEL					
1	226	57	49	24	356
2	599	360	483	473	1915
3	800	370	466	486	2122
4	815	335	455	512	2117
5	801	302	443	650	2196
6	727	250	415	630	2022
7	647	178	225	475	1525
8	373	109	154	301	937
9	188	52	68	92	400
10	124	27	32	54	237
11	46	10	14	28	98
12	39	10	4	8	61
OTHER	7	0	1	8	16
TOTALS:	5392	2060	2809	3741	14002

READING SUMMARY

1. Grade five has scores reported on the most students. With 2,196 students, they made up 16% of the sample.

2. Grades three through six made up over 60% of the sample.

3. Over 62% of the students made gains over seven months. Over 47% of the students made gains over one year, and 27% made gains over one year and five months.

4. All grades, except one and ten, showed that the majority of their students made gains over seven months.

2

MATH STUDENTS
BY MEAN GAIN & GRADE
SCHOOL YEAR

MEAN GAIN BANDS	0 - .70 MEAN GAIN	.71 - 1.00 MEAN GAIN	1.01 - 1.50 MEAN GAIN	1.51 OR MORE MEAN GAIN	TOTAL
GRADE LEVEL					
1	51	21	20	9	101
2	123	99	100	47	369
3	178	95	164	141	578
4	221	133	210	194	758
5	223	100	194	223	740
6	257	97	148	260	762
7	144	47	59	110	360
8	91	32	39	76	238
9	32	7	5	4	48
10	11	0	0	2	13
11	2	2	0	1	5
12	4	0	0	1	5
TOTALS:	1337	633	939	1068	3977

MATH SUMMARY

1. Grade six shows scores for the most students. They made up 19% of the sample with 762 students.

2. Grades three through six made up over 71% of the sample.

3. Over 66% of the students made gains over seven months. Approximately 50% of the students made gains over one year, and 27% made gains over one year and five months.

4. Except for grades one, nine, ten and twelve, all other grades showed that the majority of their students made gains over seven months.

3

READING MEAN GAIN
BY IQ AND GRADE LEVEL
SCHOOL YEAR

IQ BANDS	90 OR BELOW	91 - 100	101 - 110	111 OR ABOVE
GRADE LEVEL				
1	.34	.55	.35	.85
2	.90	1.17	1.17	1.31
3	.77	1.05	1.15	1.36
4	.82	1.02	1.16	1.38
5	.83	1.10	1.39	1.61
6	.90	1.21	1.42	1.79
7	.84	1.21	1.26	1.41
8	.82	1.09	1.51	1.47
9	.61	.79	1.16	.47
10	.49	.93	.54	1.33
11	.18	.39	.87	1.07
12	.28	-.12	.43	1.20
OTHER	1.53	.30	1.48	2.50
TOTAL MEAN GAINS	.82	1.09	1.24	1.40

READING SUMMARY

1. IQ scores were available for 74% of the Title I participants. However, not all of these students were in reading activities.

2. The mean gains in reading increase as the IQ levels increase.

3. The lowest gains are for those students in grades one and nine through twelve, no matter in what IQ band they fall. This would suggest that the reading activities in those grades may not be as successful as the ones in grades two through eight.

4

MATH MEAN GAIN
BY IQ AND GRADE LEVEL
SCHOOL YEAR

IQ BANDS	90 OR BELOW	91 - 100	101 - 110	111 OR ABOVE
GRADE LEVEL				
1	.90	.51	.47	.76
2	.90	.84	1.04	.99
3	1.06	1.02	1.18	1.32
4	.69	1.27	1.19	1.36
5	.96	1.22	1.42	1.42
6	.84	1.09	1.38	1.56
7	.72	1.20	1.24	1.32
8	.99	1.24	1.16	1.20
9	-.18	-1.12	-.53	-1.10
10	-.60	1.87		
11	1.8			
TOTAL MEAN GAINS	.85	1.12	1.24	1.31

MATH SUMMARY

1. IQ scores were available for 74% of the Title I participants. However, not all of these students were in math activities.

2. The mean gains in math generally increase as the IQ levels increase.

3. The pattern of math gains by IQ bands is not as consistent as the pattern of reading gains. Only grades three, five, six and seven consistently show increased gains with increased IQ bands.

4. Grade nine has the poorest showing in all four IQ bands. Students in this grade showed losses rather than gains in math. Similarly, the students with the lowest IQ's in grade ten showed a loss.

5

READING MEAN GAIN
BY SEX AND IQ

	BOYS	GIRLS	BOTH SEXES
IQ BANDS			
90 OR BELOW	.81	.84	.82
91 - 100	1.08	1.10	1.09
101 - 110	1.25	1.22	1.24
111 OR ABOVE	1.41	1.37	1.40
TOTAL MEAN GAINS	1.10	1.09	1.09

READING SUMMARY

1. Only students with IQ scores are included on this table.
2. The mean gain for boys in reading activities who had IQ scores was almost identical to the mean gain for girls.
3. Girls made slightly higher gains than boys in the lower IQ bands, while boys made slightly higher gains than girls in the higher IQ bands.
4. The scores of both boys and girls increased as the IQ bands increased.

6

MATH MEAN GAIN
BY SEX AND IQ

	BOYS	GIRLS	BOTH SEXES
IQ BANDS			
90 OR BELOW	.87	.82	.85
91 - 100	1.16	1.07	1.12
101 - 110	1.20	1.29	1.24
111 OR ABOVE	1.34	1.27	1.31
TOTAL MEAN GAINS	1.12	1.10	1.11

MATH SUMMARY

1. Only students with IQ scores are included on this table.
2. The mean gain for boys and girls in math activities who had IQ scores was almost identical.
3. Boys did only slightly better than girls in each of the IQ bands except 101-110.
4. The scores of both boys and girls increased as the IQ bands increased, except for girls with IQ's of 111 or above.

7

MEAN GAIN BY GRADE LEVEL
READING

GRADE LEVEL	MEAN GAIN
1	.54
2	1.13
3	.99
4	1.06
5	1.16
6	1.18
7	1.07
8	1.04
9	.87
10	.74
11	1.02
12	.34
TOTAL FOR 14,256 STUDENTS	1.05

READING SUMMARY

1. The highest gain for any grade level was in grade six with a gain of one year and almost two months.

2. The smallest gains were made by first and twelfth graders.

3. The most common test intervals were seven, eight, nine, ten and twelve months:
   (a) Students tested at the end of 7 months gained .86.
   (b) Students tested at the end of 8 months gained 1.01.
   (c) Students tested at the end of 9 months gained 1.14.
   (d) Students tested at the end of 10 months gained 1.24.
   (e) Students tested at the end of 12 months gained .78.

4. Testing at a twelve month interval may not accurately reflect student growth since they gained only .6 months for each month of instruction.

8

MEAN GAIN BY GRADE LEVEL
MATH

GRADE LEVEL	MEAN GAIN
1	.82
2	.84
3	1.11
4	1.16
5	1.21
6	1.24
7	1.06
8	1.06
9	.15
10	.51
11	.78
12	.50
TOTAL FOR 4,073 STUDENTS	1.09

MATH SUMMARY

1. The highest gain for any grade level was also in grade six with over a year and two months.

2. The smallest gains were made in grades nine, ten and twelve.

3. The most common test intervals were seven, eight, nine, ten and twelve months:
   (a) Students tested at the end of 7 months gained 1.11.
   (b) Students tested at the end of 8 months gained 1.04.
   (c) Students tested at the end of 9 months gained 1.20.
   (d) Students tested at the end of 10 months gained 1.34.
   (e) Students tested at the end of 12 months gained .98.

4. As in reading, testing at a twelve month interval may not accurately reflect student growth since they gained only .8 months for each month of instruction.

9

MATH STUDENTS
BY MEAN GAIN & TESTS GIVEN

MEAN GAIN BANDS / TESTS GIVEN	0 - .70	.71 - 1.00	1.01 - 1.50	1.51 OR MORE	TOTAL
California	182	65	88	127	462
Iowa	276	79	90	111	556
Metropolitan	278	142	218	197	835
Stanford	113	55	87	107	362
SRA	332	194	284	347	1,157
"Other"	156	98	172	179	605
TOTALS:	1,337	633	939	1,068	3,977

MATH SUMMARY

1. Again SRA tests were given most frequently to students in math activities. Approximately 29% of the students were given these tests.

2. Metropolitan tests were given to over 20% of the math students.

3. Over 50% of the students taking any of the above tests gained over seven months. Almost an even 50% of the students taking Metropolitan tests made over 7 months gain and 50% under seven months.

10

READING STUDENTS
BY MEAN GAIN & TESTS GIVEN

MEAN GAIN BANDS / TESTS GIVEN	0 - .70	.71 - 1.00	1.01 - 1.50	1.51 OR MORE	TOTAL
California	458	201	318	369	1,346
Gates-MacGinitie	1,695	639	888	1,599	4,821
Metropolitan	1,074	414	446	376	2,310
Stanford	515	221	336	352	1,424
SRA	894	321	481	616	2,312
Iowa	511	156	231	318	1,216
"Other"	245	108	109	111	573
TOTALS:	5,392	2,060	2,809	3,741	14,002

READING SUMMARY

1. Gates-MacGinitie tests were most frequently given as was true in the last two years. Over 34% of the students with reading scores took Gates-MacGinitie tests.

2. Metropolitan and SRA tests were each given to 16% of the students reporting reading scores.

3. Over 50% of the students taking any of the above tests gained over seven months.

II

READING "GRADUATES"
BY GRADE LEVEL
SCHOOL YEAR

GRADE LEVELS	PARTICIPANTS	"GRADUATES"	%
P & K	240	17	7%
1-3	9964	1692	17%
4-6	9395	1491	16%
7-9	4297	711	17%
10-12	1048	128	12%
TOTALS:	24944	4039	16%

READING SUMMARY

1. This table reflects the number of students that the Title I teachers identified as attaining grade level in reading. They were either "graduated" out of the reading program during the school year or would not be anticipated to return in next year's program.

2. Approximately 16% of all Title I reading students were thought to no longer need Title I services.

12

MATH "GRADUATES"
BY GRADE LEVEL
SCHOOL YEAR

GRADE LEVELS	PARTICIPANTS	"GRADUATES"	%
P & K	286	2	.7%
1-3	1382	445	32%
4-6	2766	693	25%
7-9	914	148	16%
10-12	99	47	47%
TOTALS:	5447	1335	25%

MATH SUMMARY

1. This table reflects the number of students that the Title I teachers identified as attaining grade level in math. They were either "graduated" out of the math program during the school year or would not be anticipated to return in next year's program.

2. Approximately 25% of all Title I math students were thought to no longer need Title I services.

omaha

The Omaha Public Schools have a very comprehensive ESEA Title I program. The multiple activities are twofold: (1) to supplement the instructional program for educationally disadvantaged children by developing a curriculum and techniques, especially in reading, which would raise their achievement level to be commensurate with their ability; and (2) to support this program with services that would make it successful. Copies of the Omaha evaluation report for Title I are included with the Nebraska Report. A brief summary of their project is included here.

Prompted by the continued need to raise the reading level of educationally disadvantaged children, emphasis in the 1974-75 proposal was on reading activities. The High Intensity Learning Centers for Reading for grades three through twelve continued to provide a sound approach for meeting the individual reading needs of children. Development of Primary High Intensity Learning Centers in Reading was continued to provide a supportive reading skill development program for grades one through three. Through use of the methods and materials involved in this management system, the training given teachers and the outstanding efforts of teachers, principals and the Reading Services Center, other dimensions were added to the school system's efforts to help the individual child in the target area.

Reading aides continued to work with primary teachers to help in meeting the reading problems of children in grades one through three by tutoring children on a one-to-one basis or in small groups as their

reading problems were identified by classroom teachers. Project READ furnished teachers and students valuable supplementary materials in the regular classroom setting to further develop the reading skills of students needing this kind of help.

A detailed analysis of the results of reading standardized tests given to Omaha Title I reading students is included in their report. However, on the basis of seventy percent of the HILINC participants in grades three through nine, the average shift in reading comprehension as measured at the "instructional level" was in excess of one full grade. The interval between pre- and posttesting was seven months. The average shift in grade equivalency for grades three through six was 1.07 and for grades seven through nine was 1.36.

A mathematics program was piloted in four schools to provide supplementary mathematics activities for eligible Title I children in grades four through eight. Two systems, considered to be parallel in basic content objectives and designed to provide prescriptive, individualized, self-motivating instruction in mathematics through the use of a systems approach were implemented.

A detailed analysis of the results of math standardized tests given to Omaha Title I math students is included in their report. However, students in both math systems showed the gains in concept learning to be greater than those in computational skills. The average gain by students in concept learning was .6 in grade 4, 1.08 in grade 5, .8 in grade 6, .99 in grade 7, and .82 in grade 8. The average gain by students in computational skills was .53 in grade 4, .46 in grade 5, .5 in grade 6, .46 in grade 7, and .77 in grade 8.

All other activities in the Title I program were directed toward providing supportive services for children in Title I instructional programs. This reinforcement was designed to give each student a greater opportunity to achieve success in school. In this capacity the Title I Media Center did printing, production and media work to support the Title I instructional program. It acted as a key element in providing continuous service for our Title I instructional activities.

The supportive Psychological Services enabled Title I schools to better meet the individual needs of students. Besides reinforcing our evaluation of the instructional programs, this activity further justified the selection of children being served and helped us to develop the goals and objectives of the students being served with Title I funds.

The Counseling Activity furnished another dimension to the Title I program by employing community aides who acted as liaison people between the school and community. These paraprofessionals kept parents informed of activities which could benefit their children and youth. They sought the assistance of various agencies to help families solve many of their immediate problems.

The evaluation aspect of this program has developed many techniques which illustrate accountability for the total program. The evaluation research demonstrated that the Omaha Public Schools have served the children and youth who should be served and in the manner outlined by the proposal.

Summer school activities consisted of a preschool program for children and a post-kindergarten program for children needing the additional six weeks of kindergarten activities to better prepare for

the next school year. The High Intensity Learning Centers in Reading provided a summer remedial reading program for students identified by their teachers and principals as needing this reinforcement. Hopefully these programs will insure student success in school.

The Omaha Public Schools have used every resource in an attempt to better educationally prepare children in the target area for their future. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been only one of the many resources used. Funds from this source have been linked with other local, state and federal programs in order to establish a stronger instructional program. Each Title I activity was planned to complement other Title I activities and the total school program in an effort to serve children and youth who are eligible and need this type of additional service.

other success

Besides monitoring the Title I projects, all approved projects were contacted and asked to complete a questionnaire. Through the questionnaires and the monitoring visits, the following information was obtained about the Nebraska Title I projects.

Approximately 24% of the Title I participants are on the free and/or reduced lunch program. The teachers who teach Title I classes have been Title I teachers for an average of 4 years and have averaged 12 years totally in teaching. They average 14 hours above a bachelor's degree and have an average of ten college credit hours in reading courses.

By keeping longitudinal gains of the Title I projects, it was hoped that we might be able to determine the elements that make up a good Title I program. There were 23 projects that had mean gains of less than seven months for three or more years. These projects had an average per pupil cost of $293. The class sizes averaged between two and seven students for an average of 33 minutes a day. Teachers in these projects had taught Title I classes for an average of three years and had taught school for an average of eleven years. The average educational level was fifteen hours above a bachelor's degree.

There were 27 projects that had mean gains over 1.2 years for three years or more. These projects consisted of elements almost identical to the other group. Their average per pupil cost was $319. The class sizes averaged between two and seven students for an average of 33 minutes a day. Teachers in these projects had taught Title I for an average of four years and had taught school for an average of twelve years. The average educational level was sixteen hours above a bachelor's degree.

After further examination of these projects, it could be concluded that one of the only differences between them was the target population. The schools with the consistently low mean gains were working with students who had an average IQ of 96. Of these students 66% were assessed below the thirtieth percentile in reading; 14% were assessed between the thirtieth and fortieth percentile; and 20% were assessed between the fortieth and fiftieth percentile. The schools with the consistently high mean gains were working with students who had an average IQ of 101. Of these students 64% were assessed below the thirtieth percentile in reading; 20% were assessed between the thirtieth and fortieth percentile; and 16% were assessed between the fortieth and fiftieth percentile. The target populations of the schools with the consistently higher mean gains had higher IQ's and weren't as low on their needs assessments as the target populations of the schools with the consistently lower mean gains.

statistics

The information in this section reflects the statistical elements of Nebraska's Title I projects. This information is broken down by school year and summer school activities. Each table has a summary of the information which is the most important on it. However, there are some significant statistics which should be summarized here.

There were 30,668 students in 256 Title I projects in Nebraska in 1974-75. This decreased from 32,331 students in 260 projects in 1973-74. The number of activities also decreased from 380 to 370. However, the number of nonpublic students increased from 3,739 to 3,885. Nonpublic students made up 11.6% of the Title I population in 1973-74 and 12.7% in 1974-75. Similarly, the number of students in summer school dropped from 5,404 to 5,069 while the number of projects increased from 44 to 48. The nonpublic students in Title I summer projects increased from 284 to 295.

Using an unduplicated count of students, there was an average of 57 students per full time teacher in Title I in school year projects and 21 students per full time teacher in summer school projects. The number of students in school year reading activities was 61 per full time teacher and 25 per full time teacher in summer school.

School year projects expended $7,383,523, while summer school projects expended $540,261 for a total of $7,923,784. The school year per pupil cost was $123 per activity and $241 per project. The summer school per pupil cost was $53 per activity and $107 per project. Reading activities cost $208 per pupil during the school year and $55 per pupil during summer school. Math activities cost $199 per pupil during the school year and $52 per pupil during summer school. The school year per pupil costs are up slightly from last year while the summer school costs are down.

13

SCHOOL YEAR
STUDENT COUNT
BY ACTIVITY & GRADE LEVEL

GRADE	P & K	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	OTHER
ACTIVITY						
Pre-School	46					
Reading	240	9964	9395	4297	989	59
Language Arts	3	83	118	55	12	
Math	286	1382	2766	914	99	
Learning Disabilities	76	301	153	15	4	
Guidance	503	2589	2735	1896	697	307
Psychological	37	126	81	141	83	24
Health-Dental		24	25			
Health-Medical	51	136	146	66	9	
Support Services	885	3743	2810	1908	701	307
Other Instruction	505	2657	2742	1912	738	307
TOTALS:	2632	21005	20971	11204	3332	1004
UNDUPLICATED:	1223	10773	11157	5685	1462	368

SCHOOL YEAR SUMMARY

1. Eleven kinds of activities were approved.
2. Grades four through six have the lowest percentage of students in more than one activity, while students classified as "other" have the highest percentage.
3. Most students in reading are in grades 1-3 (40%) and grades 4-6 (38%).
4. In math, most students are in grades 4-6 (51%) and grades 1-3 (25%).

14

STUDENT COUNT
BY ACTIVITY & GRADE LEVEL
SUMMER SCHOOL

GRADE	P & K	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	OTHER
ACTIVITY						
Pre-School	480					
Reading	108	1445	1335	159	11	4
Language Arts				13		
Math	46	850	1047	324	5	
Physical Education	14	192	199	61		
Science				12		
Learning Disabilities	21	155	76	11		
Guidance	415	282	346	35		
Speech Therapy	9	26	26			
Health-Dental			22	20		
Support Services	412	276	320	15		
Other Instruction	412	469	512	67	33	
TOTALS:	1917	3695	3883	717	49	4
UNDUPLICATED:	586	2012	1964	459	44	4

SUMMER SCHOOL SUMMARY

1. Twelve kinds of activities were approved.
2. Grades 10-12 and "other" students have the least students participating in more than one activity, while pre-school and kindergarten students participate in multiple activities most often.
3. Most students in reading are in grades 1-3 (47%) and grades 4-6 (44%).
4. In math, most students are in grades 4-6 (46%) and grades 1-3 (37%).

15

NONPUBLIC STUDENTS
SUMMER SCHOOL

ACTIVITY	PROJECTS	STUDENTS	NONPUBLIC STUDENTS
Pre-School	3	480	0
Reading	45	3062	246
Language Arts	1	13	0
Math	34	2272	123
Physical Education	6	466	22
Science	1	12	0
Learning Disabilities	3	263	0
Guidance	3	1078	0
Speech Therapy	1	61	0
Health-Dental	1	42	0
Support Services	1	1023	82
Other Instruction	3	1493	0
TOTALS:	102	10265	473
UNDUPLICATED:	48*	5069	295

* This figure includes Lincoln and Omaha, although their projects for summer activities were approved in their original applications.

SUMMER SCHOOL SUMMARY

1. There were 5,069 students in 48 projects and 102 activities. Of these students 295 (67%) were nonpublic.

2. Reading activities were approved in 94% of the projects for 60% of the students. Math activities were approved in 71% of the projects for 45% of the students.

16

NONPUBLIC STUDENTS
SCHOOL YEAR

ACTIVITY	PROJECTS	STUDENTS	NONPUBLIC STUDENTS
Pre-School	2	46	0
Reading	245	24944	3627
Language Arts	3	271	0
Math	93	5447	456
Learning Disabilities	12	549	35
Guidance	1	8727	1228
Psychological	1	492	0
Health-Dental	1	49	0
Health-Medical	4	408	59
Support Services	3	10354	1576
Other Instruction	5	8861	1576
TOTALS:	370	60148	8557
UNDUPLICATED:	256	30668	3885

SCHOOL YEAR SUMMARY

1. There were 30,668 students in 256 projects. Of these students 3,885 (13%) were nonpublic.

2. There were 370 approved activities in the 256 projects, and 51% of the students participated in more than one activity.

3. Reading activities were approved in 96% of the projects with 81% of the students. There were 93% of the nonpublic students in reading activities.

4. Math activities were approved in 36% of the projects with 18% of the students. There were 12% of the nonpublic students in math activities.

17

RATIO OF STUDENTS
TO TEACHERS
SUMMER SCHOOL

ACTIVITY	STUDENTS	TEACHERS FTE	RATIO PER TEACHER FTE
Pre-School	480	18.5	26
Reading	3062	120.5	25
Language Arts	13	1.5	9
Math	2272	76.5	30
Physical Education	466	5.6	83
Science	12	1.5	8
Learning Disabilities	263	16.0	16
Guidance	1078	0	
Speech Therapy	61	0	
Health-Dental	42	0	
Support Services	1023	0	
Other Instruction	1493	2.0	746
TOTALS:	10265	242.1	42
UNDUPLICATED:	5069	242.1 (313)	21 (16)

SUMMER SCHOOL SUMMARY

1. There were 313 teachers in Title I who taught the equivalency of 242.1 full time teachers. There were 16 students per teacher and 21 students per full time teacher.

2. Using full time equivalency figures, 50% of teacher time was spent in reading and 32% in math.

3. There were 25 students per full time teacher in reading and 30 students per full time teacher in math.

18

RATIO OF STUDENTS
TO TEACHERS
SCHOOL YEAR

ACTIVITY	STUDENTS	TEACHER FTE	RATIO PER TEACHER FTE
Pre-School	46	1.0	46
Reading	24944	410.6	61
Language Arts	271	6.2	44
Math	5447	91.4	60
Learning Disabilities	549	21.1	26
Guidance	8727	0	
Psychological	492	0	
Health-Dental	49	0	
Health-Medical	408	0	
Support Services	10354	0	
Other Instruction	8861	6.6	1343
TOTALS:	60148	536.9	112
UNDUPLICATED:	30668	536.9	57
		(625)	(49)

SCHOOL YEAR SUMMARY

1. There were 625 teachers in Title I who taught the equivalency of 536.9 full time teachers. There were 49 students per teacher and 57 students per full time teacher.

2. Using full time equivalency figures, 76% of teacher time was spent in reading and 17% in math.

3. There were 61 students per full time teacher in reading and 60 students per full time teacher in math.

19

NON-TEACHERS
BY ACTIVITY
SCHOOL YEAR

ACTIVITY	STUDENTS	CERTIFIED SUPPORT STAFF FTE	AIDES	OTHER STAFF
Pre-School	46	0	1	1
Reading	24944	37.8	303	85
Language Arts	271	.6	7	1
Math	5447	6.5	78	33
Learning Disabilities	549	1.0	17	2
Guidance	8727	1.0	0	56
Psychological	492	2.8	0	0
Health-Dental	49	0	0	1
Health-Medical	408	1.2	0	4
Support Services	10354	6.6	0	24
Other Instruction	8861	1.4	1	0
TOTALS:	60148	58.9	407	207
UNDUPLICATED:	30668	58.9 (116)	351	181

SCHOOL YEAR SUMMARY

1. There were 116 certified support personnel, like counselors and administrators, who worked the equivalency of 58.9 full time staff. They spent 64% of their time in reading activities and 11% in math.

2. There were 351 aides, 14% of whom worked in more than one activity. Also, 86% were in reading activities and 22% in math.

3. There were 181 staff, like secretaries and bookkeepers, 13% of whom worked in more than one activity. There were 47% helping in reading activities and 18% helping in math.

20

NON-TEACHERS
BY ACTIVITY
SUMMER SCHOOL

ACTIVITY	STUDENTS	CERTIFIED SUPPORT STAFF FTE	AIDES	OTHER STAFF
Pre-School	480	2.5	34	0
Reading	3062	8.4	76	32
Language Arts	13	0	0	0
Math	2272	3.5	61	27
Physical Education	466	.3	11	3
Science	12	0	0	0
Learning Disabilities	263	1.6	21	0
Guidance	1078	.6	0	0
Speech Therapy	61	.5	0	1
Health-Dental	42	1.0	0	0
Support Services	1023	1.0	0	15
Other Instruction	1493	3.3	1	17
TOTALS:	10265	22.7	204	95
UNDUPLICATED:	5069	22.7 (49)	152	80

SUMMER SCHOOL SUMMARY

1. There were 49 support personnel who worked the equivalency of 22.7 full time staff. They spent 37% of their time in reading activities and 15% in math.

2. There were 152 aides, 25% of whom worked in more than one activity. There were 50% of the aides who worked in reading activities and 40% in math.

3. There were 80 other staff, 16% of whom worked in more than one activity. There were 40% helping in reading activities and 34% helping in math.

21

PER PUPIL COST
BY ACTIVITY
SCHOOL YEAR

ACTIVITY	# OF STUDENTS	AMOUNT SPENT	COST PER PUPIL
Pre-School	46	$ 15,250	$332
Reading	24944	$5,192,976	$208
Language Arts	271	$ 67,993	$251
Math	5447	$1,081,773	$199
Learning Disabilities	549	$ 245,757	$448
Guidance	8727	$ 243,364	$ 28
Psychological	492	$ 57,995	$118
Health-Dental	49	$ 550	$ 11
Health-Medical	408	$ 14,207	$ 35
Support Services	10354	$ 203,753	$ 20
Other Instruction	8861	$ 259,905	$ 30
TOTALS:	60148	$7,383,523	$123
UNDUPLICATED:	30668	$7,383,523	$241

SCHOOL YEAR SUMMARY

1. There were 30,668 students participating in Title I projects. A duplicated count of 60,148 students participated in twelve kinds of activities.

2. The cost per pupil in an activity (duplicated count) was $123. The cost per pupil in a project (unduplicated count) was $241.

3. "Learning disabilities" cost the most per pupil at $448, and "health-dental" cost the least per pupil at $11.

4. Reading cost $208 per pupil, and math cost $199 per pupil.

22

PER PUPIL COST
BY ACTIVITY
SUMMER SCHOOL

ACTIVITY	# OF STUDENTS	AMOUNT SPENT	COST PER PUPIL
Pre-School	480	$ 45,910	$ 96
Reading	3,062	$169,043	$ 55
Language Arts	13	$ 1,833	$141
Math	2,272	$119,033	$ 52
Physical Education	466	$ 11,310	$ 24
Science	12	$ 1,833	$153
Learning Disabilities	263	$ 36,121	$137
Guidance	1,078	$ 7,053	$ 7
Speech Therapy	61	$ 655	$ 11
Health-Dental	42	$ 385	$ 9
Support Services	1,023	$ 45,623	$ 45
Other Instruction	1,493	$101,462	$ 68
TOTALS:	10,265	$540,261	$ 53
UNDUPLICATED:	5,069	$540,261	$107

SUMMER SCHOOL SUMMARY

1. There were 5,069 students participating in Title I summer projects. A duplicated count of 10,265 students participated in twelve kinds of activities.

2. The cost per pupil in a summer activity (duplicated count) was $53. The cost per pupil in a summer project (unduplicated count) was $107.

3. Science cost the most per pupil at $153, and guidance cost the least per pupil at $7.

4. Reading cost $55 per pupil, and math cost $52 per pupil.

23

AVERAGE EXPENDITURES
PER PROJECT
SCHOOL YEAR

ACTIVITY	# OF PROJECTS	AMOUNT SPENT	PER PROJECT EXPENDITURES
Pre-School	2	$ 15,250	$ 7,625
Reading	245	$5,192,976	$ 21,196
Language Arts	3	$ 67,993	$ 22,664
Math	93	$1,081,773	$ 11,632
Learning Disabilities	12	$ 245,757	$ 20,480
Guidance	1	$ 243,364	$243,364
Psychological	1	$ 57,995	$ 57,995
Health-Dental	1	$ 550	$ 550
Health-Medical	4	$ 14,207	$ 3,552
Support Services	3	$ 203,753	$ 67,918
Other Instruction	5	$ 259,905	$ 51,981
TOTALS:	370	$7,383,523	$ 19,955
UNDUPLICATED:	256	$7,383,523	$ 28,842

SCHOOL YEAR SUMMARY

1. There were 256 Title I school year projects with 370 approved Title I activities. The amount spent was $7,383,523.

2. The average per project expenditure was $28,842, while the average per activity expenditure was $19,955.

3. Most projects (245) had reading activities which cost an average of $21,196. Math activities cost an average of $11,632 in 93 projects.

4. "Guidance" cost the most with an average of $243,364, and "health-dental" cost the least with $550.

24

AVERAGE EXPENDITURES
PER PROJECT
SUMMER SCHOOL

ACTIVITY	# OF PROJECTS	AMOUNT SPENT	PER PROJECT EXPENDITURES
Pre-School	3	$ 45,910	$15,303
Reading	45	$169,043	$ 3,757
Language Arts	1	$ 1,833	$ 1,833
Math	34	$119,033	$ 3,501
Physical Education	6	$ 11,310	$ 1,885
Science	1	$ 1,833	$ 1,833
Learning Disabilities	3	$ 36,121	$12,040
Guidance	3	$ 7,053	$ 2,351
Speech Therapy	1	$ 655	$ 655
Health-Dental	1	$ 385	$ 385
Support Services	1	$ 45,623	$45,623
Other Instruction	3	$101,462	$33,821
TOTALS:	102	$540,261	$ 5,297
UNDUPLICATED:	48	$540,261	$11,255

SUMMER SCHOOL SUMMARY

1. There were 48 school districts that had 102 approved activities during the 1975 summer term and spent $540,261.

2. The average cost per summer project was $11,255, while the average cost per activity was $5,297.

3. Reading cost an average of $3,757 per summer project, while math cost an average of $3,501.

25

PERCENT OF STUDENTS AND
EXPENDITURES BY ACTIVITY
SCHOOL YEAR

ACTIVITY	# OF STUDENTS	% OF TOTAL	AMOUNT SPENT	% OF TOTAL
Pre-School	46	.07%	$ 15,250	.2%
Reading	24944	41%	$5,192,976	70%
Language Arts	271	.4%	$ 67,993	.9%
Math	5447	9%	$1,081,773	15%
Learning Disabilities	549	.9%	$ 245,757	3%
Guidance	8727	15%	$ 243,364	3%
Psychological	492	.8%	$ 57,995	.7%
Health-Dental	49	.08%	$ 550	.01%
Health-Medical	408	.7%	$ 14,207	.2%
Support Services	10354	17%	$ 203,753	3%
Other Instruction	8861	15%	$ 259,905	4%
TOTALS:	60148		$7,383,523	

SCHOOL YEAR SUMMARY

1. Most students in Title I activities were in reading. Of the unduplicated number of students, the reading students represented over 80%. They made up 41% of the duplicated count of students in activities, while they expended 70% of the money.

2. Math students made up over 17% of the unduplicated number of students. They made up 9% of the duplicated count of students in activities, and they expended 15% of the money.

26

PERCENT OF STUDENTS AND
EXPENDITURES BY ACTIVITY
SUMMER SCHOOL

ACTIVITY	# OF STUDENTS	% OF TOTAL	AMOUNT SPENT	% OF TOTAL
Pre-School	480	5%	$ 45,910	9%
Reading	3,062	30%	$169,043	31%
Language Arts	13	.1%	$ 1,833	.3%
Math	2,272	22%	$119,033	22%
Physical Education	466	4%	$ 11,310	2%
Science	12	.1%	$ 1,833	.3%
Learning Disabilities	263	3%	$ 36,121	7%
Guidance	1,078	10%	$ 7,053	1%
Speech Therapy	61	.6%	$ 655	.1%
Health-Dental	42	.4%	$ 385	.07%
Support Services	1,023	10%	$ 45,623	8%
Other Instruction	1,493	15%	$101,462	19%
TOTALS:	10,265		$540,261	

SUMMER SCHOOL SUMMARY

1. Most students in Title I summer activities were in reading. Of the unduplicated number of students, the reading students represented over 60%. They made up 30% of the duplicated count of students in activities, while they expended 31% of the money.

2. Math students made up over 44% of the unduplicated number of students. They made up 22% of the duplicated count of students in activities, and they expended 22% of the money.

appendices

MONITORING REPORT

School _____ Date _____

Reviewer(s) _____

1. Comparison of each activity mean gain and average per pupil cost in relation to similar Title I allocations to Nebraska School Districts:

   (a) General Comments:

2. Target Area Selection:

   (a) Could the school verify and document the number of low-income children as reported on page one of the application?

   Yes _____ No _____

   (b) What number of the identified free and reduced lunch group are Title I program participants? _____

3. Comparability:

   (a) Does adequate documentation exist to support the data indicated on the Comparability report? Yes _____ No _____

4. Needs Assessment:

   (a) Needs Assessment data reported within the application was verified according to locally maintained documentation?

   Yes _____ No _____

   If No - Explain what does exist and the rationale for the discrepancy.

   (b) Needs Assessment data was based upon:

   1. standardized test scores _____

   2. teacher judgment and classroom performance _____

   3. both of the above _____

5. Fiscal Management:

(a) Does the budget include personnel on an extended time basis?

Yes _____ No _____

If Yes -

(A) Has the district maintained documented evidence of hours worked? Yes _____ No _____

(B) For each person receiving Title I funds under the extended time arrangement, is the service performed according to the application? Yes _____ No _____

If No, explain the deviation:

(b) Has the district secured the approved items of equipment and materials? Yes _____ No _____

Explain any deviations:

(A) Check inventory list of equipment and "spot" check equipment for availability, location, labeling, etc.

General Comments:

(c) Identify by item all expenses incurred under administrative other:

(d) If Title I funds have been expended for in-service activities, identify the activities and participants:

(e) Have Title I funds been expended for library books?

Yes _____ No _____

If Yes - Briefly indicate the types of books purchased and where these books are physically located.

6. Parent Involvement -

(a) The district-wide Parent Advisory Council is composed of _____ members.

(b) Do parents constitute a simple majority of total membership?

Yes _____ No _____

(c) How many council meetings have been held to date in this fiscal year? _____

(d) Are minutes of these meetings on file? Yes _____ No _____

(e) Has a building level PAC group been formed?

Yes _____ No _____

(f) Are parents represented on the local PAC with children participating in the program in the majority of the membership? Yes _____ No _____

(g) How were the members on the building PAC selected for membership?

(h) Are membership lists for each PAC on file?

Yes _____ No _____

(i) Was the PAC chairman interviewed? Yes _____ No _____

Comments:

7. Non-Public Participation:

   (a) Were non-public administrators interviewed?

   Yes _____ No _____

   If Yes - name, position, and general comments:

   (b) Does evidence exist to demonstrate that "equitable" Opportunities to participate have been exhibited?

   Yes _____ No _____

   If No - explain the lack of "equitable" opportunity.

8. Supportive Services:

   (a) List any supportive services available and describe function of the personnel.

   (b) Are all recipients of Title I supportive services also participants in a Title I academic activity?

   Yes _____ No _____

9. Program Operation:

   (a) List names and positions of regular classroom teachers interviewed:

   General Comments:

(b) List names of Title I teachers and aides interviewed:
(Do Aides document time in programs?)

General Comments:

(A) Basic equipment, materials and/or equipment utilized in priority activities?

(B) Class Size? (individual, small group, large group)

(C) Type of Program? (mainstream or pull-out)

(D) Grouping? (age, ability, grade)

(E) Length of Activity? (minutes per day)

(F) Other Informal Assessment Procedure?

(G) Teacher Information:

	Teacher	Teacher	Teacher	Teacher
Teaching Years Total				
Title I Teaching Years Total				
Credit Hours in Reading				
Highest Degree and Hours Attained Beyond				

(H) What classroom subjects do the Title I students miss when attending Title I activity(s)?

(I) Does evidence exist that Title I activities are supplementary to the district program?

(J) General Comments:

10. Program Participants:

(a) How many students are directly participating in the Title I program and in each activity?

		Application
A.	Program _____	_____
B.	Reading _____	_____
C.	Mathematics _____	_____
D.	Other _____	_____

If a significant difference exists between actual participants and the number reported in the application - Explain the reason for the broad deviation.

11. Program Evaluation:

(a) Does evidence exist that program performance objectives were attained during the past fiscal year?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Do current performance objectives appear realistic and relevant to the activities being implemented?

(c) Indicate the number of program participants in reading which attained their respective grade level and were removed from the special reading program as a result of their achievement.

Number of participants which were removed from the program during or at the conclusion of school year 1972-73:	Number of participants which were removed from the program during or at the conclusion of school year 1973-74:
Grade 1 _____	Grade 1 _____
Grade 2 _____	Grade 2 _____
Grade 3 _____	Grade 3 _____
Grade 4 _____	Grade 4 _____
Grade 5 _____	Grade 5 _____
Grade 6 _____	Grade 6 _____

(d) Of the students identified in (11c), take a 20% sample of students and determine current level of achievement or progress. In this regard, complete the following information table on the sample group.

12. Culturally Deprived (LB 448):

(a) Does documentation exist for number of students reported for reimbursement under LB 448? Yes _____ No _____

(b) If a discrepancy exists, comment on the rationale for the difference in the figures:

Student ID	Current Grade Level	LAST REPORT CARD GRADES Math	Reading or English	Social Studies	MOST RECENT STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT DATA Math	Reading or Literature	%tile Composite If Available

TITLE I SUMMER MONITORING CHECK LIST

School_____ Date of Visit_____

Consultant(s)_____

Persons Interviewed_____

Position/Relation to Program_____

1. Is there a list of low-income participants? Yes____ No____

2. Are time and records of the administrator, coordinator, and secretary consistent with the application? Yes____ No____

3. Is this extended time or not? Yes____ No____

4. Were all materials requested ordered and delivered? Yes____ No____

5. Are there records showing the hours and duties of teacher aides? Yes____ No____

6. Is there a required number of working hours for teachers? Yes____ No____

7. Is there documented evidence for the need of the amount of funds requested for transportation? Yes____ No____

8. Are hours for custodial services documented and recorded? Yes____ No____

9. Is there justification to fund student body activities thru Title I monies? Yes____ No____

10. What is the actual number of participants in each grade?

Grade 1_____	Grade 5_____	Grade 9_____
Grade 2_____	Grade 6_____	Grade 10_____
Grade 3_____	Grade 7_____	Grade 11_____
Grade 4_____	Grade 8_____	Grade 12_____

11. Have there been any changes in the original class schedule? Yes____ No____

12. Are the class sizes consistent with the schedule in the application? Yes____ No____

13. Were all children qualified thru the needs assessment process? Yes____ No____
If no, why?_____

14. Were test scores and teacher judgements both used to determine priority students on the needs assessment sheets? Yes____ No____

15. Are there documented minutes for meetings held with the Parent Advisory Council? Yes____ No____

16. Has the Parent Advisory Council met prior to the summer program and will a post session meeting be scheduled? Yes____ No____

17. Is there a contract with the teachers or some form of written agreement? Yes____ No____

18. Have the names of all personnel paid from Title I funds been submitted to the SEA? Yes____ No____

19. Were personnel from all private schools consulted and given the opportunity to enroll priority students? Yes____ No____

20. Has the LEA completed or is the LEA in the process of completing the school year evaluation for 74-75? Yes____ No____

STUDENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT

School: _____

Grade Level: _____

Number of attendance centers included in assessment at this grade level: _____

Check only those areas for which assessment was made.

Area Assessed	Number of students with this particular problem			1 to 30 percentile or more than ten months behind	31 to 41 percentile or three to nine months behind	41 to 49 percentile or one to two months behind
		Low Standardized Test Scores -- National Norms				
☐	☐	11	Arithmetic/Mathematics	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	12	Language Arts (including reading)	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	13	Science	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	14	Social Science	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	15	Work-Study Skills	☐	☐	☐
			Other (list)			
☐	☐	16		☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	17		☐	☐	☐
		Low Achievement in Comparison to Classmates		Seriously	Moderately	Slightly
☐	☐	21	Arithmetic/Mathematics	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	22	Language Arts (including reading)	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	23	Science	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	24	Social Science	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	25	Work-Study Skills	☐	☐	☐
			Other (list)			
☐	☐	26		☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	27		☐	☐	☐
		Learning Disabilities				
☐	☐	31	Visual/Perceptual	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	32	Eye/Hand Motor Coordination	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	33	Auditory and Language Sequencing	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	34	Verbal Expression	☐	☐	☐

Area Assessed	Number of students with this particular problem		1 to 30 percentile or more than ten months behind — Seriously	31 to 41 percentile or three to nine months behind — Moderately	42 to 49 percentile or one to two months behind — Slightly
		Attitude			
		41 Negative Self-Image			
		42 Negative Attitude Toward School & Education			
		43 Expectation of School Failure			
		44 Low Occupational & Educational Aspiration Level			
		45 Poor Social Adjustment			
		Other (list)			
		46			
		47			
		Behavior			
		51 High Absentee Rate			
		52 Potential Dropout			
		53 Disciplinary Problem			
		54 Short Attention Span			
		55 Withdrawal			
		Other (list)			
		56			
		57			
		Other			
		61 Poor Health			
		62 Malnutrition			
		63 Emotional and Social Instability			
		64 Lack of Clothing			
		65			
		66			
		Handicapped			
		71 Mentally Retarded			
		72 Visually Handicapped			
		73 Hard of Hearing or Deaf			
		74 Speech Impaired			
		75 Emotionally Disturbed			
		76 Orthopedically Handicapped			
		77 Other Health Impaired			